

Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)  
Meghan E. George (SBN 274525)  
Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)  
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.  
21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
Phone: 877-206-4741  
Fax: 866-633-0228  
tfriedman@toddfllaw.com  
mgeorge@toddfllaw.com  
abacon@toddfllaw.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**JOHN KRISTENSEN**, individually  
and on behalf of all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

**SPRITE ENTERTAINMENT, INC.  
DBA ANIMATION SHARKS;  
DOES 1-10 Inclusive,**

Defendant.

**Case No.:**

**CLASS ACTION**

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
PURSUANT TO THE TELEPHONE  
CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,  
47 U.S.C. § 227, ET SEQ.**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. JOHN KRISTENSEN (“Plaintiff”) bring this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of SPRITE ENTERTAINMENT, INC. DBA ANIMATION SHARKS (“Defendant”), in negligently contacting Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts

1 and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including  
2 investigation conducted by their attorneys.

3 2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls and messages like the ones  
4 described within this complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff.  
5 “Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for  
6 example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to  
7 pass the TCPA.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).

8 3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice  
9 as to how creditors and telemarketers may call them, and made specific findings  
10 that “[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls and  
11 messages are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or  
12 place an inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11.  
13 Toward this end, Congress found that

14  
15 [b]anning such automated or prerecorded telephone calls to the home,  
16 except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when  
17 such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health  
18 and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting  
telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

19 Id. at § 12; see also *Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012  
20 WL 3292838, at\* 4 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on  
21 TCPA’s purpose).

22 4. Congress also specifically found that “the evidence presented to the  
23 Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an  
24 invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call....” Id. at §§ 12-13. See also,  
25 *Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744.

26 5. As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit recently explained in a  
27 TCPA case regarding calls to a non-debtor similar to this one:  
28

1 The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ... is well known for its provisions  
 2 limiting junk-fax transmissions. A less-litigated part of the Act curtails the  
 3 use of automated dialers and prerecorded messages to cell phones, whose  
 4 subscribers often are billed by the minute as soon as the call is answered—  
 5 and routing a call to voicemail counts as answering the call. An automated  
 6 call to a landline phone can be an annoyance; an automated call to a cell phone  
 7 adds expense to annoyance. *Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC*, 679 F.3d  
 8 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012).

9 6. The Ninth Circuit recently affirmed certification of a TCPA class case  
 10 remarkably similar to this one in *Meyer v. Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC*, \_\_  
 11 F.3d\_\_, 2012 WL 4840814 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. Oct. 12, 2012).

#### 12 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13 7. This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises  
 14 out of violation of Federal Law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b): *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs.,*  
 15 *LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

16 8. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central  
 17 District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because  
 18 Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in the County of Los Angeles, State of  
 19 California.

#### 20 PARTIES

21 9. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a citizen and  
 22 resident of the State of California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein  
 23 was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

24 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant  
 25 is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a company who does business within the  
 26 State of California. Defendant, is and at all times mentioned herein was a “person,”  
 27 as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39). Defendant claims to provide custom animated  
 28 videos and services to grow consumer sales. Plaintiff alleges that at all times  
 relevant herein Defendant conducted business in the State of California and in the  
 County of Los Angeles, and within this judicial district.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was a citizen of the County of Los Angeles, State of California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

12. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

13. At all times relevant Defendant conducted business in the State of California and in the County of Los Angeles, within this judicial district.

14. On or about September of 2017, Plaintiff received a text message from Defendant on his cellular telephone, number ending in -9711.

15. During this time, Defendant began to use Plaintiff’s cellular telephone for the purpose of sending Plaintiff spam advertisements and/or promotional offers, via text messages, including a text message sent to and received by Plaintiff on or about September of 2017.

16. On or about September of 2017, Plaintiff received a text message from Defendant that read:

Final 1hr Left to Activate your 90% Off Custom Animated  
Video Deal. Click Here [sharkstudios.us](http://sharkstudios.us). to Activate Now &  
Grow your Sales 1000%. Reply STOPRM to Stop

17. These text messages placed to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone were placed via an “automatic telephone dialing system,” (“ATDS”) as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (a)(1) as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

18. The telephone number that Defendant, or their agent texted was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming texts pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).

1           19. These text messages constituted texts that were not for emergency  
2 purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).

3           20. Plaintiff was never a customer of Defendant and never provided his  
4 cellular telephone number Defendant for any reason whatsoever. Accordingly,  
5 Defendant and their agents never received Plaintiffs prior express consent to  
6 receive unsolicited text messages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

7           21. These text messages by Defendant, or its agents, violated 47 U.S.C. §  
8 227(b)(1).

9                                   **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

10          22. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of and all  
11 others similarly situated (“the Class”).

12          23. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the Class, consisting of all  
13 persons within the United States who received any unsolicited text messages from  
14 Defendant which text message was not made for emergency purposes or with the  
15 recipient’s prior express consent within the four years prior to the filing of this  
16 Complaint.

17          24. Defendant and their employees or agents are excluded from the Class.  
18 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class  
19 members number in the hundreds of thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter  
20 should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this  
21 matter.

22          25. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of  
23 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through their  
24 agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular  
25 telephones by using marketing and text messages, thereby causing Plaintiff and the  
26 Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular  
27 telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and  
28

1 invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the  
2 Class members were damaged thereby.

3 26. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of  
4 economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request  
5 any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the  
6 right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons  
7 as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

8 27. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of  
9 their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties  
10 and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records or  
11 Defendant's agents' records.

12 28. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law  
13 and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and  
14 fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class  
15 members, including the following:

- 16
- 17 a) Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,  
18 Defendant or their agents sent any text messages to the Class (other  
19 than a message made for emergency purposes or made with the prior  
20 express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any  
21 automatic dialing system to any telephone number assigned to a  
22 cellular phone service;
  - 23 b) Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and  
24 the extent of damages for such violation; and
  - 25 c) Whether Defendant and their agents should be enjoined from  
26 engaging in such conduct in the future.

27 29. As a person that received at least one marketing and text message  
28 without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are  
typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the

1 interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member  
2 of the Class.

3 30. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable  
4 harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class  
5 action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In  
6 addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and  
7 Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the  
8 individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek  
9 legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

10 31. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action  
11 claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

12 32. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient  
13 adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce  
14 Defendant to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class  
15 members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against  
16 Defendant are small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual  
17 action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely  
18 to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

19 33. Defendant have acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class,  
20 thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory  
21 relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

22  
23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
24 **NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**  
25 **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

26 34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
27 Complaint as though fully stated herein.  
28



1        35. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
2 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each  
3 and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

4        36. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et  
5 seq, Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory  
6 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

7        37. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief  
8 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

9  
10                    **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
11                    **KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE**  
12                    **TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**  
13                    **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

14        38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
15 Complaint as though fully stated herein.

16        39. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
17 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not  
18 limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et  
19 seq.

20        40. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47  
21 U.S.C. § 227 et seq, Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00  
22 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §  
23 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

24        41. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief  
25 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

26                    **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

27        Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff, and The  
28 Class members the following relief against Defendant:



**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF  
THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF  
THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each Class member \$1500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

**TRIAL BY JURY**

42. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Dated: November 21, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

**THE LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.**

By: /s/Todd M. Friedman  
TODD M. FRIDMAN, ESQ.  
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF